

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Information Processing Letters

www.elsevier.com/locate/ipl

Intersection of the reflexive transitive closures of two rewrite relations induced by term rewriting systems

Sándor Vágvolgyi¹

Department of Foundations of Computer Science, University of Szeged, Árpád tér 2, H-6720 Szeged, Hungary

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 29 April 2016

Received in revised form 12 September 2016

Accepted 4 February 2018

Available online 5 February 2018

Communicated by A. Tarlecki

Keywords:

Term rewriting systems

Post Correspondence Problem

Theory of computation

ABSTRACT

We show that it is undecidable whether the intersection of the reflexive transitive closures of two rewrite relations induced by term rewriting systems is equal to the reflexive transitive closure of a rewrite relation induced by a term rewriting system.

© 2018 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In theoretical computer science, in particular in automated theorem proving and term rewriting, a binary relation \rightarrow on a set of terms is called a rewrite relation if it is closed both under context application (the “replacement” or “monotonicity” property) and under substitutions (the “fully invariant property”), see Definition 1 in [2] and Definition 4.2.2 in [1]. The inverse, the symmetric closure, the reflexive closure, and the transitive closure of a rewrite relation are again rewrite relations [2]. The intersection of two rewrite relations is again a rewrite relation, and rewrite relations form a complete lattice with respect to intersection, see Section 2.2 in [2]. A term rewrite system (TRS for short) R induces a rewrite relation \rightarrow_R [1]. A number of problems to characterise the intersection of various closures of rewrite relations induced by two TRSs have been considered in the literature [4,6,7].

By the above discussion, the intersection of the reflexive transitive closures of two rewrite relations induced by TRSs

is also a rewrite relation. Hence it is natural to ask whether this intersection is equal to the reflexive transitive closure of a rewrite relation induced by a TRS. We show that the following problems are undecidable:

INSTANCE: Two convergent linear TRSs R and S on the same ranked alphabet Σ .

QUESTION: Does there exist a TRS U on Σ such that $\rightarrow_R^+ \cap \rightarrow_S^+ = \rightarrow_U^+$?

QUESTION: Does there exist a TRS U on Σ such that $\rightarrow_R^* \cap \rightarrow_S^* = \rightarrow_U^*$?

Here \rightarrow_R^+ and \rightarrow_R^* denote the transitive closure and the reflexive transitive closure of \rightarrow_R , respectively.

2. Preliminaries

We present a review of the notions, notations and preliminary results used in the paper.

2.1. Abstract reduction systems

An abstract reduction system is a pair (A, \rightarrow) , where the reduction \rightarrow is a binary relation on the set A . \leftarrow , \leftrightarrow , \rightarrow^* , and \leftrightarrow^* denote the inverse, the symmetric closure, the reflexive transitive closure, and the reflexive transitive

E-mail address: vagvolgyi@inf.u-szeged.hu.

¹ Research was supported by the NKFI grant No. K 108448.

symmetric closure of the binary relation \rightarrow , respectively. $x \in A$ is irreducible if there is no y such that $x \rightarrow y$. $y \in A$ is a normal form of $x \in A$ if $x \rightarrow^* y$ and y is irreducible. If $x \in A$ has a unique normal form, then it is denoted by $x \downarrow$. $y \in A$ is a descendant of $x \in A$ if $x \rightarrow^* y$.

The reduction \rightarrow is called

- confluent if for all $x, y_1, y_2 \in A$, if $y_1 \leftarrow^* x \rightarrow^* y_2$, then $y_1 \rightarrow^* z \leftarrow^* y_2$ for some $z \in A$;
- terminating if there is no infinite chain $x_0 \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow \dots$;
- convergent if it is both confluent and terminating.

2.2. Terms

\mathbb{N} stands for the set of nonnegative integers, and $[1, n]$ stands for the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A ranked alphabet is a finite set Σ in which every symbol has a unique rank in \mathbb{N} . For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, Σ_m denotes the set of all elements of Σ which have rank m . The elements of Σ_0 are called constants.

For a set of variables Y and a ranked alphabet Σ , $T_\Sigma(Y)$ denotes the set of Σ -terms (or Σ -trees) over Y , and $id_{T_\Sigma(Y)}$ denotes the identity relation on $T_\Sigma(Y)$. $T_\Sigma(\emptyset)$ is written as T_Σ . A term $t \in T_\Sigma$ is called a ground term. A term $t \in T_\Sigma(Y)$ is linear if each variable in Y occurs at most once in t . We specify a countable set $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ of variables which will be kept fixed in this paper. Moreover, we put $X_m = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence $X_0 = \emptyset$.

For a term $t \in T_\Sigma(X)$, the height $height(t)$ and the set of positions $POS(t) \subseteq N^*$ of t are defined by tree induction.

- If $t \in \Sigma_0 \cup X$, then $height(t) = 0$ and $POS(t) = \{\lambda\}$.
- If $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ with $f \in \Sigma_m$, $m > 0$, then $height(t) = 1 + \max\{height(t_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ and $POS(t) = \{i\alpha \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, \alpha \in POS(t_i)\}$.

For each $t \in T_\Sigma(X)$ and $\alpha \in POS(t)$, we introduce the subterm $t/\alpha \in T_\Sigma(X)$ of t at α and define the label $lab(t, \alpha) \in \Sigma \cup X$ in t at α as follows:

- for $t \in \Sigma_0 \cup X$, $t/\lambda = t$ and $lab(t, \lambda) = t$;
- for $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ with $m \geq 1$ and $f \in \Sigma_m$, if $\alpha = \lambda$ then $t/\alpha = t$ and $lab(t, \alpha) = f$, otherwise, if $\alpha = i\beta$ with $i \in [1, m]$, then $t/\alpha = t_i/\beta$ and $lab(t, \alpha) = lab(t_i, \beta)$.

For $t \in T_\Sigma$, $\alpha \in POS(t)$, and $r \in T_\Sigma$, we define $t[\alpha \leftarrow r] \in T_\Sigma$ as follows.

- If $\alpha = \lambda$, then $t[\alpha \leftarrow r] = r$.
- If $\alpha = i\beta$, for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta \in N^*$, then $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ with $f \in \Sigma_m$ and $i \in [1, m]$. Then $t[\alpha \leftarrow r] = f(t_1, \dots, t_{i-1}, t_i[\beta \leftarrow r], t_{i+1}, \dots, t_m)$.

For a term $t \in T_\Sigma(X)$, $var(t)$ denotes the set of variables occurring in t , i.e. $var(t) = \{x_i \mid \text{there exists } \alpha \in POS(t) \text{ such that } lab(t, \alpha) = x_i\}$.

For trees $t \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, and $t_1, \dots, t_m \in T_\Sigma(X)$, we denote by $t[t_1, \dots, t_m]$ the tree obtained by substituting t_i

for every occurrence of x_i in t , for each $i \in [1, m]$. We say that $t \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$ is a pattern of $s \in T_\Sigma(X)$, if there are $t_1, \dots, t_m \in T_\Sigma(X)$ such that $s = t[t_1, \dots, t_m]$.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, an n -context over Σ is a term $u \in T_\Sigma(X_n)$ with exactly one occurrence of the variable x_i for each $i \in [1, n]$. $C_{\Sigma, n}$ denotes the set of n -contexts over Σ . Note that $C_{\Sigma, 0} = T_\Sigma$. Let $C_\Sigma = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_{\Sigma, n}$. We call a mapping $\omega : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ a weight function. The weight function ω can be extended to a function $\omega : C_\Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as follows: let $\omega(u) = \sum_{f \in \Sigma} \omega(f) \cdot |u|_f$, where $|u|_f$ denotes the number of occurrences of symbol f in u . Thus, $\omega(u)$ simply adds up the weight of all occurrences of symbols of Σ in u .

An alphabet Δ is any finite nonempty set, Δ^* stands for the set of words over Δ , and λ denotes the empty word. For an alphabet Δ , we consider the ranked alphabet $\Delta \cup \{\#\}$, where $\# \notin \Delta$. Here each element of Δ is a unary symbol and $\#$ is a constant. Then we consider a tree in $T_{\Delta \cup \{\#\}}$ as a word over the alphabet $\Delta \cup \{\#\}$. For example, let $\Delta = \{a, b\}$. Then the tree $a(b(b(a(\#))))$ is written as the word $abba\#$. Conversely, for each word $w \in \Delta^*$, the word $w\#$ over the alphabet $\Delta \cup \{\#\}$ can be considered as a tree over the ranked alphabet $\Delta \cup \{\#\}$. For example, the word $aab\#$ can be considered as the tree $a(a(b(\#)))$.

For an alphabet Δ , we also consider the alphabets $\overline{\Delta} = \{\overline{a} \mid a \in \Delta\}$ and $\underline{\Delta} = \{\underline{a} \mid a \in \Delta\}$. The alphabets Δ , $\overline{\Delta}$, and $\underline{\Delta}$ are pairwise disjoint. For each word $w \in \Delta^*$, the word $\overline{w} \in \overline{\Delta}^*$ is defined as follows.

- If $w = \lambda$, then $\overline{w} = \lambda$.
- If $w = az$ for some $a \in \Sigma$ and $z \in \Delta^*$, then $\overline{w} = \overline{a} \overline{z}$.

For each word $w \in \Delta^*$, we define the word $\underline{w} \in \underline{\Delta}^*$ in a similar way to \overline{w} .

2.3. Term rewriting systems

Let Σ be a ranked alphabet. Then a term rewriting system (TRS) R on Σ is a finite subset of $(T_\Sigma(X) - X) \times T_\Sigma(X)$. For an element (l, r) of a TRS R , $var(r)$ is a subset of $var(l)$, and $l \notin X$. Elements (l, r) of R are called rules and are denoted by $l \rightarrow r$. The TRS R is linear if for each rule $l \rightarrow r$, both l and r are linear. A TRS R is context replacing if for each rule $l \rightarrow r$ of R , l and r are n -contexts for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let R be a TRS over Σ . For any terms $s, t \in T_\Sigma(X)$, position $\alpha \in POS(s)$, and rule $l \rightarrow r$ in R with $l, r \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that s rewrites to t applying the rule $l \rightarrow r$ at α , and denote this by $s \rightarrow_{l \rightarrow r, \alpha} t$ if there are $s_1, \dots, s_m \in T_\Sigma(X)$ such that $s/\alpha = l[s_1, \dots, s_m]$ and $t = s[\alpha \leftarrow r[s_1, \dots, s_m]]$. Here we also say that s rewrites to t and denote this by $s \rightarrow_R t$.

We say that a TRS R is confluent, terminating, or convergent, if \rightarrow_R has the corresponding property. For a term $t \in T_\Sigma$, $R^*(t) = \{p \mid t \rightarrow_R^* p\}$ is the set of descendants of t , and $R^+(t) = \{p \mid t \rightarrow_R^+ p\}$ is the set of proper descendants of t .

Proposition 2.1. Let TRS R be a context replacing TRS such that for each rule $l \rightarrow r$ in R , $\omega(l) > \omega(r)$. Then R is terminating.

Proof. By direct inspection of the definitions. \square

For the concept of a critical pair, see [1] or [5].

Proposition 2.2. [1,5]. *If a TRS R is terminating and has no critical pairs, then R is convergent.*

2.4. Post correspondence problem

A Post Correspondence System (PCS for short) over an alphabet Δ is a pair $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle = (\langle w_1, \dots, w_n \rangle, \langle z_1, \dots, z_n \rangle)$, $n \geq 1$, of lists of nonempty words over the alphabet Δ . We say that the nonempty word $i_1 \dots i_\ell$ over the alphabet $[1, n]$ is a solution of the PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$, if

$$w_{i_1} \dots w_{i_\ell} = z_{i_1} \dots z_{i_\ell}.$$

Cf. [3]. The Post Correspondence Problem is the question whether or not a given PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ has a solution.

Proposition 2.3. [3] *The Post Correspondence Problem is unsolvable. That is, there is no algorithm which takes a PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ as input and determines whether or not there is a solution of the PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$.*

3. Main results

We assign two TRSs R and S to a PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$, and study the connection between a solution of $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ and the intersection $\rightarrow_R^+ \cap \rightarrow_S^+$.

Let $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle = (\langle w_1, \dots, w_n \rangle, \langle z_1, \dots, z_n \rangle)$ be a Post Correspondence System over the alphabet Δ . We associate the ranked alphabet Σ and the TRSs R and S over Σ with the PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$.

Let $\Sigma = \Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$, $\Sigma_0 = \{\#\}$, $\Sigma_1 = \Delta \cup \overline{\Delta} \cup \underline{\Delta} \cup [1, n] \cup \overline{[1, n]} \cup \underline{[1, n]}$, $\Sigma_2 = \{f\}$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\Delta \cup \overline{\Delta} \cup \underline{\Delta}$ is disjoint with $[1, n] \cup \overline{[1, n]} \cup \underline{[1, n]}$.

The TRS R consists of the rules

- (a) $k\# \rightarrow \overline{k}\#$ for each $k \in [1, n]$,
- (b) $\delta\# \rightarrow \overline{\delta}\#$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$,
- (c) $j\overline{k}x_1 \rightarrow \overline{j}kx_1$ for all $j, k \in [1, n]$,
- (d) $\gamma\overline{\delta}x_1 \rightarrow \overline{\gamma}\delta x_1$ for all $\gamma, \delta \in \Delta$, and
- (e) $f(\overline{w_k}x_1, kx_2) \rightarrow f(x_1, x_2)$ for each $k \in [1, n]$.

The left-hand sides of the rules of type (a) or (b) of R contain symbols in the set $\{\#\} \cup [1, n] \cup \Delta$. The right-hand sides of the rules of type (a) or (b) of R contain symbols in $\overline{[1, n]} \cup \overline{\Delta}$. Both sides of the rules of type (c) or (d) of R contain a symbol in $\overline{[1, n]} \cup \overline{\Delta}$. The left-hand sides of the rules of type (e) of R contain a symbol in $\overline{[1, n]} \cup \overline{\Delta}$, and applying a rule of type (e) of R , we delete symbols in $\overline{[1, n]} \cup \overline{\Delta}$.

Symmetrically, the TRS S consists of the rules

- (a) $k\# \rightarrow \underline{k}\#$ for each $k \in [1, n]$,
- (b) $\delta\# \rightarrow \underline{\delta}\#$ for each $\delta \in \Delta$,
- (c) $j\underline{k}x_1 \rightarrow \underline{j}kx_1$ for all $j, k \in [1, n]$,
- (d) $\gamma\underline{\delta}x_1 \rightarrow \underline{\gamma}\delta x_1$ for all $\gamma, \delta \in \Delta$, and
- (e) $f(\underline{w_k}x_1, kx_2) \rightarrow f(x_1, x_2)$ for each $k \in [1, n]$.

We now define the weight function $\omega : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.

- $\omega(f) = 0$,
- $\omega(g) = 2$, $\omega(\overline{g}) = 1$, and $\omega(\underline{g}) = 1$ for every $g \in \Delta$, and
- $\omega(k) = 2$, $\omega(\overline{k}) = 1$, and $\omega(\underline{k}) = 1$ for every $k \in [1, n]$.

Statement 3.1. *R and S are convergent linear TRSs.*

Proof. Observe that R and S are context replacing TRSs and hence are linear. Furthermore, for each rule $l \rightarrow r$ in R , $\omega(l) > \omega(r)$. Consequently, by Proposition 2.1, R is terminating. By direct inspection of the rules of R , we get that R has no critical pairs. Thus, by Proposition 2.2, R is convergent. Analogously, we obtain that S is convergent and linear as well. \square

Statement 3.2. *Let the nonempty word $i_1 \dots i_c$ over the alphabet $[1, n]$ be a solution of the PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$. Then*

$$R^+(f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#)) \\ \cap S^+(f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#)) = \{f(\#, \#)\}$$

and

$$R^*(f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#)) \\ \cap S^*(f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#)) \\ = \{f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#), f(\#, \#)\}.$$

Proof. Consider the reduction sequence

$$\begin{aligned} & f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#) \\ & \rightarrow_R f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots \overline{i_c} \#) \rightarrow_R \dots \\ & \rightarrow_R f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, \overline{i_1 i_2 \dots i_c} \#) \rightarrow_R \dots \\ & \rightarrow_R f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots \overline{w_{i_c}} \#, \overline{i_1 i_2 \dots i_c} \#) \rightarrow_R \dots \\ & \rightarrow_R f(\overline{w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c}} \#, \overline{i_1 i_2 \dots i_c} \#) \\ & \rightarrow_R f(\overline{w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c}} \#, \overline{i_2 \dots i_c} \#) \rightarrow_R \\ & f(\overline{w_{i_3} \dots w_{i_c}} \#, \overline{i_3 \dots i_c} \#) \rightarrow_R \dots \\ & \rightarrow_R f(\overline{w_{i_c}} \#, \overline{i_c} \#) \rightarrow_R f(\#, \#). \end{aligned}$$

Here R applies a rule of type (a) in the first step, then rules of type (c), a rule of type (b), then rules of type (d), and finally rules of type (e).

Analogously, we have the reduction sequence

$$\begin{aligned} & f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#) \\ & \rightarrow_S f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots \underline{i_c} \#) \rightarrow_S \dots \\ & \rightarrow_S f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, \underline{i_1 i_2 \dots i_c} \#) \rightarrow_S \dots \\ & \rightarrow_S f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots \underline{w_{i_c}} \#, \underline{i_1 i_2 \dots i_c} \#) \rightarrow_S \dots \\ & \rightarrow_S f(\underline{w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c}} \#, \underline{i_2 \dots i_c} \#) \rightarrow_S \\ & f(\underline{w_{i_3} \dots w_{i_c}} \#, \underline{i_3 \dots i_c} \#) \rightarrow_S \dots \\ & \rightarrow_S f(\underline{w_{i_c}} \#, \underline{i_c} \#) \rightarrow_S f(\#, \#). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the symbols in the set $\overline{[1, n]} \cup \overline{\Delta}$ do not appear in the rules of S . Similarly, the symbols in the set $[1, n] \cup \underline{\Delta}$ do not appear in the rules of R . Hence

$$R^+(f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#)) \\ \cap S^+(f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#)) = \{f(\#, \#)\}$$

and

$$R^*(f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#)) \\ \cap S^*(f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#)) \\ = \{f(w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_c} \#, i_1 i_2 \dots i_c \#), f(\#, \#)\}. \quad \square$$

Statement 3.3. *If PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ has a solution, then there is no TRS U on Σ such that $\rightarrow_R^* \cap \rightarrow_S^* = \rightarrow_U^*$.*

Proof. On the contrary, assume that PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ has a solution, and that there is a TRS U on Σ such that $\rightarrow_R^* \cap \rightarrow_S^* = \rightarrow_U^*$. Let $a = \max\{\text{height}(l) \mid l \rightarrow r \in U\}$. Let the nonempty word $i_1 \dots i_\ell$ over the alphabet $[1, n]$ be a solution of the PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$. Then $b \cdot \ell > a$ for some $b \geq 1$. Furthermore, $(i_1 \dots i_\ell)^b$ is also a solution of the PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$. Let us denote the word $(i_1 \dots i_\ell)^b$ by $k_1 \dots k_c$, where $c = b \cdot \ell$, $k_1 = i_1, \dots, k_\ell = i_\ell, k_{\ell+1} = i_1, \dots, k_c = i_\ell$. Consequently, by Statement 3.2, $R^*(f(w_{k_1} w_{k_2} \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#)) \cap S^*(f(w_{k_1} w_{k_2} \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#)) = \{f(w_{k_1} w_{k_2} \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#), f(\#, \#)\}$. Then

$$U^*(f(w_{k_1} w_{k_2} \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#)) \\ = \{f(w_{k_1} w_{k_2} \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#), f(\#, \#)\}.$$

Hence we have $f(w_1 w_2 \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#) = s_0 \rightarrow_U s_1 \rightarrow_U s_2 \rightarrow_U \dots \rightarrow_U s_d = f(\#, \#)$ for some $d \geq 1$, where $s_1 \neq f(w_{k_1} w_{k_2} \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#)$. We now show that $s_1 \neq f(\#, \#)$. On the contrary, assume that $s_1 = f(\#, \#)$. Then along the reduction $f(w_1 w_2 \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#) \rightarrow_U f(\#, \#)$, U applies a rule $f(v_1, v_2) \rightarrow f(\#, \#)$ at the position λ , where $v_1 \in T_\Sigma(X)$ is a pattern of $w_1 w_2 \dots w_{k_c} \#$ and $v_2 \in T_\Sigma(X)$ is a pattern of $k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#$. By the definition of a , and the inequality $c > a$, $v_1 \in T_\Sigma(X)$ is a pattern of $w_1 w_2 \dots w_{k_c} 1\#$ as well. Thus, $f(w_1 w_2 \dots w_{k_c} 1\#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#) \rightarrow_U f(\#, \#)$. However, $f(w_1 w_2 \dots w_{k_c} 1\#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#) \rightarrow_R^* f(\#, \#)$ does not hold by $(\Delta \cup \overline{\Delta}) \cap ([1, n] \cup \overline{[1, n]}) = \emptyset$. This contradicts the inclusion $\rightarrow_U^* \subseteq \rightarrow_R^*$. Thus $s_1 \neq f(\#, \#)$. Therefore $s_1 \notin \{f(w_{k_1} w_{k_2} \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#), f(\#, \#)\}$, which contradicts the equation

$$U^*(f(w_{k_1} w_{k_2} \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#)) \\ = \{f(w_{k_1} w_{k_2} \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#), f(\#, \#)\},$$

because $s_1 \in U^+(f(w_1 w_2 \dots w_{k_c} \#, k_1 k_2 \dots k_c \#))$. \square

Analogously to Statement 3.3, we can show the following.

Statement 3.4. *If PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ has a solution, then there is no TRS U on Σ such that $\rightarrow_R^+ \cap \rightarrow_S^+ = \rightarrow_U^+$.*

Statement 3.5. *Let $s, t \in T_\Sigma(X)$ such that $s \rightarrow_R^+ t$ and $s \rightarrow_S^+ t$. Then PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ has a solution.*

Proof. Consider the R -reduction sequence (1) and the S -reduction sequence (2).

$$S = p_0 \rightarrow_{l_0 \rightarrow r_0, \alpha_0} p_1 \rightarrow_{l_1 \rightarrow r_1, \alpha_1} \dots \\ \rightarrow_{l_{m-1} \rightarrow r_{m-1}, \alpha_{m-1}} p_m = t, \quad m \geq 1, \quad (1) \\ S = q_0 \rightarrow_{l'_0 \rightarrow r'_0, \beta_0} q_1 \rightarrow_{l'_1 \rightarrow r'_1, \beta_1} \dots \rightarrow_{l'_{d-1} \rightarrow r'_{d-1}, \beta_{d-1}} q_d = t, \\ d \geq 1. \quad (2)$$

Claim 3.6. *For each $0 \leq i \leq m-1$ and for each position $\gamma \in POS(p_i)$, if $\text{lab}(p_i, \gamma) = f$, then α_i is not a proper prefix of γ .*

Proof. We proceed by induction on i .

Base Case: $i = 0$. Let position $\gamma \in POS(p_0)$ be such that $\text{lab}(p_0, \gamma) = f$. We proceed by contradiction. Assume that α_0 is a proper prefix of γ . Observe that the constant $\#$ appears in the left-hand sides of rules of types (a) and (b), thus $l_0 \rightarrow r_0$ is not of type (a) or (b). The left-hand sides of the rules of type (c) or (d) or (e) of R contain a symbol in $\overline{[1, n]} \cup \overline{\Delta}$. Consequently, if the rule $l_0 \rightarrow r_0$ is of type (c) or (d) or (e), then those symbols in $\overline{[1, n]} \cup \overline{\Delta}$ which appear in l_0 , also appear in p_0 . Recall that the symbols in $\overline{[1, n]} \cup \overline{\Delta}$ do not appear in the rules of S . Hence S cannot simulate the application of $l_0 \rightarrow r_0$ along (2). Thus $l_0 \rightarrow r_0$ is not of type (c) or (d) or (e) either.

Induction Step: Let $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, and assume that the claim holds for $1, \dots, i-1$. We proceed by contradiction, and assume that α_i is a proper prefix of γ . Observe that the constant $\#$ appears in the left-hand sides of rules of types (a) and (b), thus $l_i \rightarrow r_i$ is not of type (a) or (b). The left-hand sides of the rules of type (c) or (d) or (e) of R contain a symbol in $\overline{[1, n]} \cup \overline{\Delta}$. Consequently, if the rule $l_i \rightarrow r_i$ is of type (c) or (d) or (e), then those symbols in $\overline{[1, n]} \cup \overline{\Delta}$ which appear in l_i , also appear in p_i . By the induction hypothesis, $\text{lab}(p_0, \gamma) = f$, and these symbols also appear in p_0 at the same position as in p_i . Recall that the symbols in the set $\overline{[1, n]} \cup \overline{\Delta}$ do not appear in the rules of S . Hence S cannot simulate the application of $l_i \rightarrow r_i$ along (2). Thus $l_i \rightarrow r_i$ is not of type (c) or (d) or (e) either. \square

Similarly to Claim 3.6, we have the following result. For each $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ and for each position $\gamma \in POS(q_i)$, if $\text{lab}(q_i, \gamma) = f$, then α_i is not a proper prefix of γ . Hence there is $\alpha \in POS(s) \cap POS(t)$ such that

- $s/\alpha \rightarrow_R^+ t/\alpha$ and $s/\alpha \rightarrow_S^+ t/\alpha$,
- $s/\alpha = f(u_1, u_2)$, $u_1, u_2 \in T_\Sigma$, f does not appear in u_1 or u_2 , and
- $t/\alpha = f(v_1, v_2)$, $v_1, v_2 \in T_\Sigma$, f does not appear in v_1 or v_2 .

In the light of the description of the rules of R presented right after the definition of R , we argue as follows. By the reductions $s/\alpha \rightarrow_R^+ t/\alpha$ and $s/\alpha \rightarrow_S^+ t/\alpha$, we have $u_1 = v\#$ and $u_2 = p\#$ for some $v \in \Delta^*$ and $p \in [1, n]^*$. Moreover,

$$s/\alpha = f(v\#, p\#) = \eta_0 \rightarrow_R \eta_1 \rightarrow_R \cdots \rightarrow_R \eta_a = t/\alpha, \quad a \geq 1, \quad (3)$$

where R applies a rule of type (a) in the first step, then rules of type (c), a rule of type (b), then rules of type (d), and finally rules of type (e). Consequently, $t/\alpha = f(\#, \#)$, $v = w_{i_1} \dots w_{i_\ell}$ and $p = i_1 \dots i_\ell$ for some nonempty word $i_1 \dots i_\ell$ over the alphabet $[1, n]$.

Symmetrically,

$$s/\alpha = f(v\#, p\#) = \xi_0 \rightarrow_S \xi_1 \rightarrow_S \cdots \rightarrow_S \xi_b = t/\alpha, \quad b \geq 1, \quad (4)$$

where S applies a rule of type (a) in the first step, then rules of type (c), a rule of type (b), then rules of type (d), and finally rules of type (e). Therefore, $v = z_{i_1} \dots z_{i_\ell}$. Hence the word $i_1 \dots i_\ell$ is a solution of the PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$. \square

Corollary 3.7. *If PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ has no solution, then $\rightarrow_R^+ \cap \rightarrow_S^+ = \rightarrow_\emptyset^+$ and $\rightarrow_R^* \cap \rightarrow_S^* = \rightarrow_\emptyset^*$.*

Proof. By contradiction. Assume that $\rightarrow_R^+ \cap \rightarrow_S^+ \neq \rightarrow_\emptyset^+$. Since $\rightarrow_\emptyset^+ = \emptyset$, there are $s, t \in T_\Sigma(X)$ such that $s \rightarrow_R^+ t$ and $s \rightarrow_S^+ t$. Consequently, by Statement 3.5, PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ has a solution.

Assume that $\rightarrow_R^* \cap \rightarrow_S^* \neq \rightarrow_\emptyset^*$. Since $\rightarrow_\emptyset^* = id_{T_\Sigma(X)}$, there are $s, t \in T_\Sigma(X)$ such that $s \rightarrow_R^* t$ and $s \rightarrow_S^* t$ and $s \neq t$. Hence $s \rightarrow_R^+ t$ and $s \rightarrow_S^+ t$. Then, as we have already seen above, PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ has a solution. \square

Statements 3.3 and 3.4 and Corollary 3.7 imply the following.

Corollary 3.8. *The following three statements are equivalent.*

- The PCS $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z} \rangle$ has no solution.
- There exists a TRS U on Σ such that $\rightarrow_R^+ \cap \rightarrow_S^+ = \rightarrow_U^+$.
- There exists a TRS U on Σ such that $\rightarrow_R^* \cap \rightarrow_S^* = \rightarrow_U^*$.

By Proposition 2.3, Statement 3.1, and Corollary 3.8, we have our main result.

Theorem 3.9. *The following problems are undecidable:*

INSTANCE: Two convergent linear TRSs R and S on the same ranked alphabet Σ .

QUESTION: Does there exist a TRS U on Σ such that $\rightarrow_R^+ \cap \rightarrow_S^+ = \rightarrow_U^+$?

QUESTION: Does there exist a TRS U on Σ such that $\rightarrow_R^* \cap \rightarrow_S^* = \rightarrow_U^*$?

Finally, we present our conjecture.

Conjecture 3.10. *The following problem is undecidable:*

INSTANCE: Two TRSs R and S on the same ranked alphabet Σ .

QUESTION: Does there exist a TRS U on Σ such that $\leftrightarrow_R^* \cap \leftrightarrow_S^* = \leftrightarrow_U^*$?

References

- [1] F. Baader, T. Nipkow, *Term Rewriting and All That*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 1998.
- [2] N. Dershowitz, J.-P. Jouannaud, Rewrite systems, in: J. van Leeuwen (Ed.), *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. B: Formal Methods and Semantics, chap. 6, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990, pp. 243–320.
- [3] M. Harrison, *Introduction to Formal Language Theory*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Boston, MA, USA, 1978.
- [4] F. Otto, Disjointness of congruences generated by finite monadic string-rewriting systems that are confluent is undecidable in general, *Bull. Eur. Assoc. Theor. Comput. Sci.* 64 (1998) 342–348.
- [5] Terese, *Term Rewriting Systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 2003.
- [6] S. Vágvölgyi, Congruential complements of ground term rewrite systems, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 238 (1–2) (2000) 247–274.
- [7] S. Vágvölgyi, Intersection of finitely generated congruences over term algebra, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 300 (1–3) (2003) 209–234.